

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/779,541	02/12/2004	Julian Nikolchev	016355-002440US	6018
8791	7590 05/06/2005		EXAM	INER
BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN 12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD SEVENTH FLOOR			BROWN, M	ICHAEL A
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
LOS ANGELE	ES, CA 90025-1030		3764	

DATE MAILED: 05/06/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/779,541	NIKOLCHEV ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Michael Brown	3764			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim y within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from , cause the application to become ABANDONEI	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on					
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	action is non-final.				
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims					
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or					
Application Papers					
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.				
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	•				
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
Attachment(s) 1) X Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:				

Application/Control Number: 10/779,541

Art Unit: 3764

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1 and 5-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Mohajer.

Mohajer discloses in figures 1-5 a contraceptive device comprising an intraluminal body 10 which is at least in part radially expandable (note fig. 1 and fig. 3) about a longitudinal axis from a first configuration (fig. 3) to a second configuration (fig. 3) and a contraceptive agent (col. 8, lines 23-26).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ritchart in view of Leeper.

Ritchart discloses in figures 1-10 a contraceptive device 14 which is at least in part radially expandable about a longitudinal axis having an open frame work (the coil is open in its expanded state), the coil is a helical wire and has a lumen (fig. 2b) and a

Application/Control Number: 10/779,541

Art Unit: 3764

medicine carried by the device (col. 10, lines 1-4). Ritchart, also teaches that the device can be an intrauterine device (col. 10, lines 12-15). However, Ritchart does not disclose that the medicine is used for contraceptive purposes. Leeper teaches in figure 1 a contraceptive that is a helical device carrying a contraceptive material (anti-virals, col. 9,line18-20). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made that the contraceptive material as taught by Leeper could be substituted for the medicine disclosed by Ritchart in order to use the contraceptive material to prevent pregnancy.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the reference as applied to claims above, and further in view of Strubel.

Strubel teaches in figure 1 a contraceptive having a coil 3 made of copper. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made that the helical coil disclose by Ritchart could be fabricated of copper as taught by Strubel because copper is a shape memory material.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. No additional prior art was cited during the first office action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Brown whose telephone number is 571-272-4972. The examiner can normally be reached on 5:30 am-4:00 pm Monday-Thursday.

Art Unit: 3764

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gergory Huson can be reached on 571-272-4887. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

M. Brown May 2, 2005

MICHAEL A. BROWN PRIMARY EXAMINER

Michael 9- Br